

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-9 remain pending, with claims 1 and 9 being independent. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally filed disclosure, including, for example, in Fig. 1, as well as paragraphs [0024] and [0026] of the Specification. Therefore, it is submitted the amendments recite no new matter.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Block et al. (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0055689), and claim 5 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Block et al. in view of Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,620).

The rejections are respectfully traversed, as it is submitted the claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Office Action asserts Block et al. discloses, *inter alia*, allowing access to a host server, wherein the host server is in communication with, and provides access to, a plurality of travel vendor databases, user multi-use point service terminals, and Global Distribution Systems, with a specific citation to paragraph [0157] of Block et al. as disclosing this features. Office Action, pp. 2 and 3. The Office Action further asserts that paragraph [0164] of Block et al. shows that Global Distribution System providers, such as Sabre, Worldspan, Amadeus, and Galileo, as well as a variety of Internet based booking engines, such as Travelocity, are

utilized by a traveler to make travel decisions, and that the traveler is given access to these travel resources through a central server. Office Action, p. 9.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that Block et al. does not disclose the host server in communication with, and providing access to, a plurality of travel vendor databases, user multi-use point of services terminals, and Global Distribution Systems, as recited in independent claims 1 and 9 of the present application. For example, paragraph [0157] of Block et al., cited in the Office Action, does not in any way reference a server in communication with, and allowing access to, travel vendor databases or Global Distribution Systems. Paragraph [0164] of Block et al., also cited in the Office Action, refers to “certification-level data” being shared with Global Distribution System providers and Internet based booking engines. Block et al.’s “certification-level data” relates to an airport or travel port’s equipment, data utilization, and so forth. Block et al., paragraph [0162]. Thus, the “certification-level data” is not data a user of Block et al.’s disclosed system would need communicated between a host server and Global Distribution System providers or Internet based booking engines as part of making travel arrangements. As such, Block et al. does not disclose a host server in communication with, and providing access to, Global Distribution System providers or Internet based booking engines, nor is there any reason to assume that Block et al. inherently includes such features. Accordingly, Block et al. cannot be understood to anticipate or suggest independent claims 1 and 9 of the present application.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejections, and solely to advance prosecution, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to even further clarify the distinctions with the cited references.

Specifically, claim 1 now recites receiving a travel booking for the travel plan by a first one of the travel channels, wherein “the travel booking may be received from a travel customer through a travel network as well as from the travel customer through of a combination of the Internet and the travel network[.]” Similarly, claim 9 recites a booking reception element adapted to receive a travel booking for the travel plan by a first one of the travel channels, wherein “the booking reception element may receive the travel booking from a travel customer through a network as well as from the travel customer through a combination of the Internet and the network[.]” The network enables, *inter alia*, an open consistent vehicle for a traveler to request to initiate, modify or cancel travel bookings for any type of travel (airline, bus, train, car, etc.) regardless of the travel channel used. See, e.g., paragraph [0024] of the Specification of the present application. At the same time, the combination of the Internet and the network allows for the Internet to be another access interface for a user to access the system. See, e.g., paragraph [0034] of the Specification of the present application.

Block et al., on the other hand, appears to disclose that a user may only access the “Airport America” system through the Internet. See, e.g., Block et al., Figs. 1 and 2, paragraph [0048]. To this end, Block et al. repeatedly refers to the Internet, and to this end, the “website” or “homepage” functionality of the system. See, e.g., Block et al., paragraphs [0049], [0051] (disclosing that a user is presented with a homepage for making reservations and travel arrangements), [0065], [0070] (disclosing a list of websites which may allow access to the system). Nowhere does Block et al. disclose a network integration with the system in addition to the Internet connections. Block et al., therefore, cannot provide both an open consistent vehicle for all requests to initiate,

modify or cancel travel bookings and an Internet interface for a second communication interface, unlike the present invention recited in claims 1 and 9.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Office Action cites Walker et al. as suggesting the use of an unformatted e-mail message, and thus rendering claim 5 obvious when considered in conjunction with the teachings of Block et al. Assuming, *arguendo*, that Walker et al. does suggest such a feature, it is submitted that the reference does not cure the above-described deficiencies of Block et al. As such, the combination of Block et al. and Walker et al. fails to render unpatentable independent claims 1 and 9.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from claim 1, and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the above-described reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

It is submitted that this Amendment After Final Rejection does not raise any new issues requiring further consideration or search. Accordingly, it is submitted that entry of the Amendment is appropriate.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1693791_1.DOC